

MI Child Support Formula - Feedback Regarding Proposed Changes in Child Support Calculations

From: Kathy <spartanovich@yahoo.com>
To: <mcsf@courts.mi.gov>
Date: 6/26/2003 5:28 PM
Subject: Feedback Regarding Proposed Changes in Child Support Calculations

I don't believe the proposed changes in child support will have the intended effect nor an appropriate effect, especially ADM 2003-22:3 and ADM 2003-22:10. I believe the intention of these proposals is to benefit the noncustodial parent while not adversely affecting the child(ren). I believe they achieve the former objective while being ultimately detrimental to the child(ren). I believe the latter objective should take precedence. In other words, the welfare of the children should be first and foremost.

For example, in my personal situation, the noncustodial parent will not use the funds from the reduction in support to change his residence in order to provide more suitable living conditions for our children (after all, we are not talking about a corresponding increase in visitation) yet child support to the custodial parent (me) will be reduced enough that I will have to go from a 3 bedroom to a 2 bedroom house in a less safe neighborhood.

The overall effect is detrimental to the children.

Also, just because a child visits their noncustodial parent more than 52 nights a year doesn't result in corresponding additional expense to the noncustodial parent, unless the children have incredibly overaverage appetites and the noncustodial parent either insists on eating out or cooks only gourmet feasts. There is no increase in housing or clothing expense which are more significant expenses. So they take a shower and maybe turn an extra light on! The home will still require climate control, regardless of whether the noncustodial parent is there alone or with the children. For that matter, the custodial parent still has to heat or cool their home, even while the children visit the noncustodial parent.

Case in point, our two little girls sometimes, but not always, take a bath (together at the same time in the same bathtub with the same water) at their father's, the noncustodial parent. They watch television with him, that he would be watching anyway. They each eat half a grilled cheese sandwich or a bowl of macaroni and cheese while they are there. You are considering reducing WEEKLY child support by an amount comparable to the expense the noncustodial parent incurs all YEAR!

In short, greatly reducing what the noncustodial parents pay in these cases will benefit the noncustodial parent but will ultimately hurt the child(ren) because of the resulting detriment to the means of the custodial parent in providing for the children. The lifestyle of the children will deteriorate significantly, because of significantly reduced support to the parent with whom the children still reside the very large majority of the time. And at a time when budgets are already tighter than tight!

I provide their health insurance coverage. I pay the health care premiums (a fact which is not even reflected in the calculation of child support, in our case). I make sure they have nourishing food, warm clothes, and the best roof over their heads I can possibly provide. I am the custodial parent. Now you want the children to get by with less because of some potentially-politically-correct-at-the-moment movement, supported by statistics which can be skewed to support various conclusions. The bottom line is that you are proposing to significantly reduce the bottom line for the very children (your future constituents) you are charged with protecting. You are taking food out of their mouths, clothes off their

backs, destabilizing them and moving them away from their friends and to a more dangerous neighborhood. Shame on you!